

## **REMARKS**

Claim 23, as currently amended, removes the language previously present in claim 23 that the first and second inking rollers 317 and 318, as depicted in red on the colored copy of Fig. 3 of the subject application, are both movable. The inking roller 317 is depicted in Fig. 3 as being movable. However, in various embodiments, it does not need to be movable. The inking roller 318 is the one which is referred to in the currently amended claim 23 as the at least first one of these first and second inking rollers which is a movable roller. In the prior art Hummel reference, the generally equivalent roller would be the inking roller 10. As will be discussed below, and for the reasons set forth in the Second Amendment of March 17, 2009, claim 23, as currently amended, is quite different in structure and operation from the device that is shown in the Hummel reference.

In the subject invention, as recited in currently amended claim 23 there are provided two ink paths from the first ink distribution cylinder 316 to the forme cylinder 304. A first, front ink path is from the first ink distribution cylinder 316 to the second inking roller 317, which may or may not be movable, and from the second inking roller 317 to the second ink distribution cylinder 324 and then to the ink application roller 325. This is when the second inking roller 317 is in direct contact with both of the first and second ink distribution cylinder 316 and 324.

A second, rear ink path is from the movable inking roller 318 through the third and fourth inking rollers 319, 320 to the third ink distribution cylinder 321 and the ink application rollers 322 and 323. The second rear ink path has two

different ways that it receives its ink. In the solid line position of the movable inking roller 318, as depicted in Fig. 4 of the subject application, the second, rear ink path receives its ink from the second ink distribution cylinder 324. Since that second ink distribution cylinder 324 was provided with ink by the inking roller 317, the ink which the second ink distribution cylinder 324 is able to pass on the movable inking roller 318 is split between the movable inking roller 318 and the ink application roller 325. The result is that the second, rear ink path receives relatively little ink.

If the movable inking roller 318 is moved to its dashed line position, as shown in Fig. 4, it receives ink directly from the first ink distribution cylinder 316. It then passes that ink along to the subsequent inking rollers 319, 320 and from there to the third ink distribution cylinder 321 and to the ink application rollers 322 and 323, as was done in the solid line position of the movable inking roller 318. The difference is that when the movable inking roller 318 is in its dashed line position, it receives more ink than it does when it is in its solid line position. In its dashed line position, the movable inking roller 318 received ink directly from the first ink distribution cylinder 316. In its solid line position, the movable inking roller 318 receives ink only indirectly from the first ink distribution cylinder 316, with that ink first going to the inking roller 317, then to the second ink distribution cylinder 324 and only then to the movable inking roller 318. In both of the second rear ink paths, the path of travel from the movable inking roller 318 to the former cylinder 304 is the same. The difference is the path from the first ink distribution cylinder 316 to the movable inking roller 318.

Claim 23, as currently amended, recites that the movable inking roller 318 is movable between the two positions shown in Fig. 3. In the solid line position, it is in direct contact with the second ink distribution cylinder 324 and is out of contact with the first ink distribution cylinder 316. In the dashed line position, it is in direct contact with the first ink distribution cylinder 316 and is out of contact with the second ink distribution cylinder 324. In both positions, the movable inking roller 318 is not in contact with the inking roller 317.

The language of currently amended claim 23 removes the recitation of the possibly movable inking roller 317. In that respect, the language of currently amended claim 23 is believed to be less complicated and is more clearly directed to the believed patentable features of the subject invention.

Turning now to the prior art Hummel patent; as depicted in the colored copy of Fig. 4 thereof, which was filed with the Second Amendment, the differences between it and the printing group recited in currently amended claim 23 are believed to be quite clear. Initially, it is to be kept in mind that the rotational direction of the forme cylinder 2 in the Hummel device is counterclockwise while the rotational direction of the forme cylinder 304 in the subject inventions is clockwise. The effect of this rotational difference is that the path locations and the roller locations in Hummel are reversed from what they are in the subject invention.

In Hummel, the first, front ink path includes the first ink distribution cylinder 9, the inking roller 11, the second ink distribution cylinder 6 and the first two ink application rollers 5, in the direction of rotation of the forme cylinder 2. The

second, rear ink distribution path indicates that third ink distribution cylinder 321 and the second and third ones of the ink application rollers 5, again in the direction of rotation of the forme cylinder 2. In substantial contact to the subject invention, the third ink distribution cylinder 7 is supplied with ink either directly from the second ink application roller 5 and from the movable inking roller 10, when that movable inking roller 10 is in the position shown in Fig. 4, or is supplied with ink only from the second ink application roller 5 when the movable inking roller 10 is out of contact with the third ink distribution cylinder 7 when the movable inking roller is moved out of contact, as indicated by the double-headed arrow to the left of the movable inking roller 10.

It is to be noted that in the Hummel arrangement, both of the inking rollers 10 and 11 are movable. That is similar to the arrangement of the inking rollers 317 and 318 in the subject invention. However, in the Hummel device, the movable inking roller which is part of the second, rear inking path; i.e. roller 10, is always in contact with the first ink distribution cylinder 9 and is selectively in contact with the third ink distribution cylinder 7. In the subject invention, the movable inking roller 318 is always in contact with the third ink distribution cylinder 321, through the inking rollers 319 and 320, and is selectively in contact with only one of the first ink distribution cylinder 316 and the second ink distribution cylinder 324. The movable inking roller 10 of Hummel, which is equivalent to the movable inking roller 318 of the subject invention, is always in contact with the first ink distribution cylinder 9. That significant difference between the subject invention, as recited in currently amended claim 23, and the

prior art depicted in the Hummel reference is why Hummel neither anticipates, nor renders obvious the subject invention.

Independent claim 30 of the subject application has been amended in a manner that is consistent with the language currently set forth in amended claim 22. Claim 30 is thus also believed to be allowable. Claim 30 was rejected as being unpatentable over Hummel in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,290,360 to Fisher. The Fisher patent was cited as showing the use of axially movable rollers in a dampening system. The arguments presented in the Second Amendment filed March 17, 2009, with respect to the patentable differences between the combination of Hummel and Fisher are still relevant to the language of currently amended claim 30. The features of currently amended claim 30, which are missing from Hummel, as they were with respect to claim 23, are also not shown now in the Fisher reference, as they were not shown in Fisher, taken in combination with Hummel for the reasons set forth in the Second Amendment that was filed on March 17, 2009.

Several of the dependent claims have been amended to conform their language to the language set forth in currently amended claim 23 or 30. All of these dependent claims depend, either directly or indirectly from one or the other of believed allowable, currently amended claims 23 or 30. These dependent claims are thus also believed to be allowable.


## **SUMMARY**

The claims of the subject application have been further amended to more clearly point out the believed patentable subject matter of the subject invention and to remove an unneeded limitation. Allowance of the claims and passage of the application to issue is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

Andreas Ewald Heinrich BERNARD et al.  
Applicants

JONES, TULLAR & COOPER, P.C.  
Attorneys for Applicant



Douglas R. Hanscom  
Reg. No. 26,600

April 16, 2009  
JONES, TULLAR & COOPER, P.C.  
Customer No. 23294  
P.O. Box 2266 Eads Station  
Arlington, Virginia 22202  
Phone: (703) 415-1500  
Fax: (703) 415-1508  
Attorney Docket: W1.2242 PCT-US